DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 123 199 SP 010 063

AUTHOR Howell, Maxwell L.; Howell, Reet A.
TITLE Comparative Physical Education and Sport: The Area Defined.
PUB DATE 5 Apr 76
NOTE 18p.; Paper given to International Relations council of American Alliance of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Athletics; *Comparative Analysis; *Comparative Education; Definitions; Educational History; Educational Objectives; Global Approach; *Physical Education; Social Sciences
IDENTIFIERS *Comparative Physical Education

ABSTRACT

The emerging field of comparative physical education and sport, or international physical education and sport, rests squarely on the shoulders of comparative education; an understanding and appreciation of the latter is necessary for an understanding of tne former. Comparative education is an older field of study and has gone through certain stages in its development. They include: "primitive" comparative education; a period of cultural borrowing; the exchange of information about education from nation to nation; studies of national character; and increased use of the methodologies of the social sciences. (The author quotes extensively from many scholars in the field who represent diverse viewpoints on the methodologies, aims, and purposes of comparative education.) Comparative physical education and sport has emerged in recent years as part of the interest in the sociocultural or humanitarian aspects of physical education. Comparative physical education has gone through the same stages as comparative education but with a lower quality of scholarship. Movement into a scientific approach has been slow and spasmodic. What is evident is that though the field of comparative physical education and sport uses the techniques of history, philosophy, economics, sociology, anthropology, and political science, and though the work has obvious interdisciplinary aspects, it is more than any one of the social sciences. (SK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED123199

SP 010 063

COMPARATIVE PHYSICAL EDUCATION & SPORT:
THE AREA DEFINED

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

by

Maxwell L. Howell

Reet A. Howell

San Diego State University
San Diego, California

Paper given to International Relations Council
of American Alliance of Health, Physical Education & Recreation

2

Milwaukee
April 5, 1976

The emerging field of comparative physical education and sport and/or international physical education and sport rests squarely on the shoulders of comparative education, and an understanding and appreciation of the latter is necessary for an understanding and appreciation of the former. Comparative education, indeed, is the father of comparative physical education and sport and, indeed, both areas naturally have common problems.

Comparative education, however, is an older field of study, has attained at this point a greater sense of history, sophistication and, indeed, confusion, mainly because of the greater number of scholars associated with comparative education. Scholars agree to disagree, Brian Holmes and Edmund King both from the University of London, for example, not seeing eye to eye when it comes to purposes and methodology. There have been various stages in comparative education, according to Noah and Eckstein (1:3-7): "primitive" comparative education consisted of the recorded observations of non-expert travellers, and this unscientific approach remains in the field today; this was followed in the early nineteenth century by expert travellers, mainly administrators, politicians and teachers, who carefully examined aspects of education in other countries in order to influence change in education in their own country—a period of cultural borrowing. The third period consisted essentially of the exchange of information about education from nation to nation—scholars and officials passed detailed information from one country to another; the fourth stage was coincidental with the increase in interest and sophistication in the social sciences, and was concerned with the understanding that education mirrored the society and indeed, the schools influenced society. It was hoped that by shaping education through change, society itself could be changed. Studies at this time relied heavily

on history and philosophy, and became studies of national character; the fifth stage was indeed one of sophistication, of increased use of methodologies of the social sciences, particularly sociology, economics, political science and anthropology—quantitative methods were increasingly utilized.

"Modern" comparative education began with Marc-Antoine Jullian de Paris in 1817, characterized by cultural borrowing. This was followed in the first half of the twentieth century by such as Sir Michael Sadler, and then Robert Ulich and Isaac Kandel, Nicholas Hans and Joseph Lauwerys. These scholars saw the connection between the particular society and education. Considerable attention was on the historical and social factors and forces within a particular society, it being felt that education could not be seen as an isolated entity in society, but particular forms of education had emerged because of the subtle intermingling of societal factors. The use of more sophisticated social science methods, with a view to prediction, saw the emergence of such comparative educators as Harold Noah, Max Eckstein, George Bereday, Brian Holmes, Edmund King, Torsten Husen and A. Kazamias.

The field of comparative education has relied heavily on the methodology of other disciplines and has vacillated, in its history, as to its relevance on those disciplines—from the methods utilized in history and philosophy, the original directions, to the social sciences, sociology, economics, political science and even anthropology. As the methodologies have varied, so too have the aims and purposes.

Jullien, in 1817 (1:40), felt that:

> Education, as all other sciences and all the arts, is composed of facts and observations. It, therefore, seems necessary to form . . . collections of facts and observations, arranged in analytical charts, which permit them to be related and compared, to deduct from them certain principles, determined rules, so that education might become almost nearly a positive science, rather

> than be abandoned to the narrow and limited views, to the caprices and to arbitration of those who control it . . .

The changing emphases within comparative education can be easily seen by a study of the definitions. Nicholas Hans, for example, felt that the aim of comparative education was (4:66-67) "to study each national system separately in its historical setting and its close connection with the development of national character and culture" and "to collect data on existing systems of education in various countries." He felt that an education was an "outward expression of national character," and a study of a country's education would therefore reveal distinctive features of that society. He went on to say (6:1-2):

> . . . as their national past was formed by factors often common to many nations and as their ideals of the future are the outcome of universal movements, the problems of education in different countries are similar and the principles which guide their solution may be compared and even identified. The analytical study of these factors from an historical perspective and the comparison of attempted solutions of resultant problems are the main purpose of Comparative Education.

Kandel likewise believed in this national-traditional approach. He felt (6:2) that comparative education is:

> . . . a comparison of variant philosophies of education based not on theories but on the actual practices which prevail . . . The study of foreign systems of education means a critical approach and a challenge to one's own philosophy and, therefore, a clearer analysis of the background and basis underlying the educational system of one's own nation.

The significance of national character was emphasized (4:61):

> It is no accident or no mere coincidence that the pragmatic philosophy of education is peculiarly American and that American education is founded on the idea of progress, while the French emphasize the progress of ideas and the cult of reason. It is important, therefore, as a means of appreciating and understanding the significance of a national system of education to consider the bearing of a nation's character upon its education.

Such an emphasis naturally had to be a part of the methodology (9:571-572):

> The methodology of comparative education is determined by the purpose that the study is to fulfill. If the aim is to learn something about an educational system, a description without explanation would be sufficient. . . From the point of view of comparative education such an account is limited, but is an essential first step in the process of study. . . If the discipline is worth pursuing, it is essential that the student search into the educational system or systems that he is studying. His task is to learn what forces determine the character of a system, what accounts for differences or similarities between two or more systems, how one system proceeds to solve problems that it has in common with other systems, and so on. He will not find answers to these and many other questions from information about the fabric of the system that he studies. Nor will he garner what should be the finest product of comparative study—ability to analyze his own systems of education and add something to the philosophy underlying it.

Mallinson subscribed, in the main, to the viewpoints of Hans and Kandel. He felt that (6:2):

> Education . . . is a social force in the sense that any educational system must reflect closely the ethos of the people it is called upon to serve.
>
> . . . we are primarily concerned with national character. . . with showing that any apparently revolutionary change that takes place in a people's outlook and way of life is really the outcome of slow cumulative effort in strict keeping, in reality, with national characteristics. . .
>
> . . . the purpose of education as a social force and seen on the national scale is that of assuring cultural continuity mainly through fostering the growth and development of national characteristics that will act as a stabilizing force.

And the study of the purposes of education led Mallinson to define comparative education (6:10-11):

> By the expression "comparative study of education" we mean a systematic examination of other cultures and other systems of education deriving from those cultures in order to discover resemblances and differences, the causes behind resemblances and differences, and why variant solutions have been attempted (and with what result) to problems that are often common to all. To identify the problems of education thus becomes the most important preliminary task of the research worker in the subject. To become familiar with what is being done in some other countries than their own, and why it is done, is a necessary part of the training of all serious students of educational issues of the day. Only in that way will they be properly fitted to study and understand their own systems and to plan intelligently for the future which, given the basic cultural changes

> that have taken place with such astonishing rapidity throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, is going to be one where we are thrown into ever closer contact with other peoples and other cultures.

Robert Ulich, writing as late as 1967, reinforces the need for the basis of comparative studies to be historical in nature. As he stated (8:vii):

> It [his book] is historical, because the author is convinced that one cannot comprehend the nature of the educational process without seeing it in its historical context. But . . . [it] . . . is also comparative, because only by the means of comparison will those features come clearly to light which distinguish the educational evolution in one country from that in others.

The philosophical emphasis was perhaps exemplified by Joseph Lauwerys. He does not underrate the national character approach, but feels that there is more merit in considering the philosophy of a nation. As Jones put it (4:73):

> Lauwerys himself, writing with R. King Hall in the Introduction in the 1956 Year Book of Education, subscribed to the view that social and political philosophy clearly shape educational aims ("as is society, so is education," they wrote). Parenthetically, it is worth noting that Lauwerys strongly stresses the role of nationalism in providing education on so wide a scale today, but he also points to other more international factors at work (commercialism and industrialism for instance), a reflection perhaps of his vigorous championship of internationalism. But this in no way detracts from his main point, the importance of a society's attitude to education, "the institutionalized expression of its social philosophy." Lauwerys states that explanation is always connected with some philosophy—nothing can be entirely objective. Thus he suggests that there are national styles in philosophy, or "different styles of arguing," such as American pragmatism or French rationalism. He believes that the establishment of a predominant mode, or modes, of thought in a culture can be linked to every aspect of educational organization in that culture, including the kind of school curriculum, the organization of the schools, and the methods of teaching employed.

The former writers have been among those who have subscribed mainly to the historical-philosophical traditions of comparative education;

another group of comparative educators have looked to the social sciences to improve the scientific methodology of comparative education.

Edmund King, for example (10:61), though because of his popular area studies his scientific position is often debated:

> . . . allows that comparative education has a variety of aims. In addition to the historical phases which he, like every other comparativist, distinguishes he sees a number of degrees of commitment to comparative education as a practical study. First, and lowest, he sees comparative education as an informative-analytical aid, especially to students interested in education, "by showing the 'wholeness' of cultures." Second, he sees it as a repository of techniques ("or working experience") to assist the analyses of problems or delineation of topics where some study is proposed. Next, it provides criteria for specific inquiries like international surveys, but above all comparative education helps secure effective implementation of disciplines. He believes the theoretical and the practical, "as interdependent and complementary," provide for a rational progression of comparative studies in education, with the highest attainment being active commitment of one's own comparative studies to public service.

Bereday, in his book Comparative Method in Education, comes to terms with his own position (3:ix-x):

> It is too late to be content with the definition of comparative education as being "what people who call themselves comparative educators do. . ." Comparative education has a clear subject matter of its own—the schools of the world in their many manifestations. It has a specific methodological concern that it shares with comparative law, comparative government, cross-cultural studies in anthropology, and other comparative disciplines, a concern for the development of valid methods of comparison.
>
> Comparative education has or should have a firm mooring within the precincts of one of the older social sciences. Its strongest affinity is to political science, or perhaps to geography. Apart from such major methodological commitment, comparative education relies on the methods of a host of other fields, from philosophy to psychology, from literature to statistics. Its specific task is to bring several of the concerns of the humanities and the social sciences together in application to a geographical perspective of education. That is why comparative education cannot simply be a part of history of education or of sociology of education or of international education.

> Insofar as methods of comparative education are those of liberal arts, it might well be viewed as current history of education. Insofar as comparative education is a social science, it might well be a part of anthropology or sociology or economics of education. But comparative education is not any of these disciplines alone. Rather, it is partly all of them together.

Holmes, in a foreword to the book on Comparative Education: Purpose and Method by Phillip E. Jones (4: ix-xi) reinforces Bereday's overall viewpoint:

> Our aim of comparative education is theoretical. It is to improve our understanding of education as such; and in particular of our own national problems in education. Comparative education has a practical purpose too. It should help administrators to reform their schools more effectively and efficiently. These two tasks are sometimes regarded as antithetical. In my opinion they are not. The engineer needs the physicist and mathematician. The social reformer likewise needs a basis of tested theory on which to build.
>
> Comparative education as a theoretical generalizing social science consists of those theories, hypotheses, models, and laws which facilitate our understanding of the processes of education. The aim of a comparative educationist interested in this aspect of his subject is to build up a pattern of testable hypotheses and develop conceptual models which will enable complex data to be classified and functional relationships examined. The theoretical scientist moreover is interested in putting his hypotheses to the test of experience. Slowly there is emerging in comparative education a body of theoretical knowledge which justifies our belief that the study is worthy of being ranked with the sociology and economics of education as a discipline in its own right.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> In the past, comparative education relied heavily for interpretative analysis on the work of historians. Now the data and techniques of sociology and economics are being used—with some success. Psychometrists entering the field have made serious errors on a grand scale. No doubt there is need for more studies based on political science methods and the techniques of modern philosophy. Comparative educationists have always been modest enough to maintain that the approach to their work should be interdisciplinary. But it is more than any one of the so-called social sciences. Its data and methods of enquiry are unique and while benefitting from the development of other social sciences cannot be seen as part of any one of them.

Jones tended to take a more middle-of-the-road approach as to

definition, based on a study of past comparative educators. He stated (4:11):

> Unfortunately, the state of the art is such that it would be foolhardy to advance any one single definition. The fact of the matter is that different people see comparative education in different ways. . . sharp disagreements about the objectives. . . still exists. . . there emerges a concept of the study as a vital aid to policy decision and planning in education, so that the theme with which the present writer is very much in sympathy—the usefulness of comparative education for the reform of education . . .

As to the purposes of comparative education, Jones (4:22-26) stated they were four-fold, relating to the practical aspects of studies, the humanitarian viewpoint, i.e. the need to improve social conditions and better understand the world; the need for communication and understanding among peoples, and the need for planning, on rational and scientific foundations rather than opinion.

As he stated (4:25-26):

> . . . comparative education at one and the same time must be concerned with the practical problems of educational development, education's role in providing better communication and understanding, and its humanitarian responsibilities. Yet it must also concern itself with wisely guiding the planners as they inevitably take over more and more of the control of the educational process and life generally. Increasingly judgments will be made in terms of practical necessity, humanitarian needs, and essential development policies. . .
>
> . . . the study of comparative education may be viewed from a number of different angles. These range from that of academic interest and curiosity to the very practical view of attempting solutions to educational difficulties. We need to remember, however, that comparative education by itself is no panacea for the world's educational ills . . .

The area of comparative physical education has emerged in recent years, as a part of interest in the socio-cultural or humanitarian aspects of physical education. This total area was defined by Howell as (11:13);

> . . . the study of man in social and cultural settings in his relation to sport and physical education—his thoughts and feelings in relation to self and others in the context of sport and physical education, and the

> history of those developments; and the role of sport and physical education in various cultures, civilizations and societies.

Howell attempted to delineate, with more clarity, the various interest areas or sub-disciplines incorporated in the socio-cultural area. A comprehensive education in the socio-cultural area for physical education majors, it was argued, should include at least the following sub-disciplines: the sociology of sport, history of physical education and sport, comparative physical education and sport, anthropology and physical activities, philosophy of physical education and sport, social psychology of physical education and sport history of art in physical education and sport, and archaeology of physical education and sport.

The field of comparative physical education and sport has travelled a similar route to that of comparative education, but to this point it has not attracted the quality of scholars that has graced the field of comparative education. Many of the same errors have been repeated, but perhaps this was understandable in an emerging field. In summary, there have been the visits of naive, followed by expert travellers, cultural borrowing of systems and ideas from other countries, the exchange of information from country to country, and slowly, but ever so slowly, incursions into and utilization of information from the social sciences.

Comparative physical education has had its area and its national studies, has done its cultural borrowing, has likewise placed faith in the concept of national character, the national-traditional approach, has had its original grounding more in history and philosophy. The same ground as in education has, essentially, been covered, but with nowhere near the scholarship.

The cultural borrowing was obvious, as the Ling and the Jahn and the English systems of games were utilized by many countries. Exchanges

have been particularly common in sport, as athletes and coaches and administrators have travelled from country to country in competition and techniques have been exchanged. National studies have appeared, like Nurmberg's (Howell) study of Estonia (13), in which the researcher had complete command of the Estonian language. Regional studies were undertaken by such as Howell and Van Vliet in their study of the U.S.S.R., Yugoslavia, Denmark, Sweden and West Germany. Exchanges were likewise in evidence in written form by such as the Council of Europe publications, Youth and Development Aid, Physical Education and Sport and Training the Trainer (15). Representatives from each of the eighteen countries in the Council of Europe met to exchange information on out-of-school education, and hence their study, though not sophisticated, was a landmark in the field of comparative physical education and sport. The UNESCO study on The Place of Sport in Education, involving 14 countries, which was a questionnaire study on 1) the general attitude towards the place of sport in education, 2) the practice of sport for educational purposes at schools and universities and 3) the practice of sport for educational purposes outside the school or university, was likewise a step forward in regional studies. The three ICHPER studies, involving 48 countries, Physical Education and Games in the Curriculum, Teacher Training for Physical Education and Status of Teachers for Physical Education likewise improved the quality of international information, though the limitations of the survey were clearly evident.

The movement into the scientific approach, more the comparative approach, utilizing disciplines in the social sciences, has been slow and spasmodic. Morrison's thesis, "A Rationale For the Development of Comparative Physical Education" provided a rationale for the development of comparative studies in physical education and concluded (18:143):

> Selected literature in the fields of comparative education, cultural anthropology, and sociology has been researched. With a reasoned eclecticism, certain portions of various conceptual frameworks have been modified and utilized. . . to provide a strategic structure to approach comparative studies systematically, and in a manner which purports to highlight certain subtle, covert, or latent influences of physical education which more narrowly-conceived frameworks might miss. In effect, this study represents an additional step toward bringing the social sciences to the service of physical education.

Morrison's observations were well in advance of the actual studies being performed, using areas of the social sciences in a scientific approach. Some examples were the comparative studies or attitudes pioneered by Kenyon comparing the attitudes toward sport of American Canadian, German and Australian youngsters, of which Semotiuk's thesis was an example (19). The work on the standardization of physical fitness testing in the world and the comparative testing led by the International Committee on the Standardization of Physical Fitness Tests likewise utilized physiology of exercise and statistical methodology in their comparative studies, whereas Kenyon leaned heavily on sociological and statistical techniques.

The theoretical frameworks, then, gradually appeared in the physical education literature. The work by Morrison was an innovation, but Semotiuk's thesis (20) "The Development of a Theoretical Framework for Analyzing the Role of National Government Involvement in Sport and Physical Education and Its Application to Canada" likewise pointed the way to more systematic approaches.

A number of books have made significant contributions to the field of comparative physical education and sport. The bibliographic works of Myrtis Herndon are an invaluable source to the scholar (21,22) and have demonstrated the range of available research studies. The book by Vendien and Nixon (23) The World Today in Health, Physical Education and

Recreation, was a first in the field and made a significant contribution. It consisted, primarily, of area studies. The 1975 book by Bennett, Howell and Simri (24) added another dimension to the emerging discipline as the topical approach was utilized, and questionnaires provided more comparative information for the scholar.

There is no agreement among scholars, to this point, as to the definition of comparative physical education and sport. Semotiuk, for example, stated (20:16) that it is:

> A field of study which has as its focal point, a systematic analysis of problems and programs of sport and physical education through comparison of two or more countries, in order to reveal similarities and differences.

This is similar to the definition utilized by Howell and Mutimer (12:32):

> Comparative Physical Education and Sport, then, may be defined as the process of examining the physical activities carried on in two or more societies, cultures, countries or areas, for purposes of comparing likenesses and dissimilarities.

Anthony has summarized the aims as follows (24:4):

1. To establish reliable data on each country and system, separately and collectively.
2. To search for regularities by analyses of differences and similarities, with particular attention to the relation of theory to practice.
3. To try to understand the past, to predict future trends, and to assist in the formulation of policy.
4. To examine the need for the reform of one's own methods and systems and to contribute to a universal improvement of standards and knowledge.
5. To relate knowledge in the specific field of sport and physical education to that in all other relevant disciplines.

Bennett, Howell and Simri add another purpose (24:4): "To find out what people in other countries think about physical education and sport in your country."

The definition utilized by Bennett, Howell and Simri would appear to be more in line with current thinking in comparative education (24:3-4):

> Again, as with comparative education, there is no universally accepted definition of comparative physical education and sport. In the main, it is considered to be a comparative analysis of dominant characteristics and developments in physical education and sport in two or more societies, cultures, countries, or areas for purposes of investigating their similarities and differences. It involves the study of contemporary school and sport programs in terms of the philosophical foundation; their historical, geographical, economical, political, educational, and cultural background; their aims, problems, and solutions; and their implications for other countries. Moreover, issues such as sport and politics, sport and race, sport and economics, sport and internationalism, and amateurism and professionalism are analyzed.

Utilizing the approach of Jones in comparative education (4:22-26), the purposes of comparative physical education and sport, then would be the practical aspects of such studies, the humanitarian aspects, to improve social conditions and better understand the world, the need for increased understanding among peoples, and the need for planning, to have rational and scientific foundations rather than opinion to base judgments.

And, utilizing the scientific approach of Holmes (4:ix-xi) and adding a few words:

> Comparative [physical] education as a theoretical generalizing social science consists of those theories, hypotheses, models and laws which facilitate our understanding of the processes of [physical] education. The aim of a comparative [physical] educationist interested in this aspect of his subject is to build up a pattern of testable hypotheses and develop conceptual models which will enable complex data to be classified and functional relationships examined. The theoretical scientist moreover is interested in putting his hypotheses to the test of experience. Slowly there is emerging in comparative [physical] education a body of theoretical knowledge which justifies our belief that the study is . . . a discipline in its own right.

What is clearly evident is that the field of comparative physical education and sport, as with comparative education, though the techniques of fields such as history, philosophy, economics, sociology, anthropology and political science will be utilized, and though the work has obvious inter-disciplinary aspects, it is more than any one of the social sciences. As Holmes said of comparative education (4:xi): "Its data and methods of enquiry are unique and while benefitting from the development of the social sciences cannot be seen as part of any one of them." It is an exceedingly complex area, ranging from the humanities to the social sciences, and is deserving of the attention of sophisticated scholars in the future.

REFERENCES

1. Fraser, Stewart, Jullien's Plan for Comparative Education 1816-1817, (Columbia University, Teacher's College: Bureau of Publications, 1964), 147 pp.

2. Noah, Harold J. and Eckstein, Max A., Toward a Science of Comparative Education, (London: The Macmillan Co, 1968), 222 pp.

3. Bereday, George Z. F., Comparative Method in Education, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), 302 pp.

4. Jones, Phillip E., Comparative Education: Purpose and Method, (St. Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1971), 201 pp.

5. Fraser, Stewart E. and Brickman, William W., A History of International and Comparative Education, (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1968), 495 pp.

6. Mallinson, Vernon, An Introduction To The Study of Comparative Education, (London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1957), 249 pp.

7. Holmes, Brian, Problems In Education: A Comparative Approach, (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965), 326 pp.

8. Ulich, Robert, The Education of Nations: A Comparison in Historical Perspective, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967), 365 pp.

9. Kandel, I. L., "The Methodology of Comparative Education," International Review of Education, 5:3, 1959, pp. 271-72.

10. King, Edmund J., "Comparative Studies and Policy Decision," Comparative Education, 4:1, 1967, p. 61.

11. Howell, Reet, "The Socio-Cultural Area," Sport Sociology Bulletin, Spring, 1975, vol. 4, No. 1, p. 13.

12. Howell, Maxwell L. and Mutimer, Brian T., "Toward Comparative Physical Education and Sport," Canadian Journal of History of Sport and Physical Education, pp. 31-37.

13. Nurmberg (Howell), Reet Ann, "Sport and Physical Education in Estonia," Ed.D. Thesis, University of California at Berkeley, 1972.

14. Howell M. L. & Van Vliet, M. L., Physical Education and Recreation in Europe, (Ottawa: Fitness and Amateur Sport Directorate, 1965).

15. Council for Cultural Cooperation of the Council of Europe, Series III - Out-of-School Education: 1) Youth and Development Aid; 2) Physical Education and Sport; 3) Training the Trainer, Strasbourg, 1963-64.

16. The Place of Sport in Education - A Comparative Study, (Paris: UNESCO Publications, 1956).

17. Physical Education and Games in the Curriculum; Teacher Training for Physical Education; Status of Teachers of Physical Education, Strasbourg, ICHPER, 1963.

18. Morrison, Donald Hugh, "A Rationale For The Development Of Comparative Physical Education," M.A. Thesis, University of Alberta, May 1967, 153 pp.

19. Semotiuk, Darwin M, "The Attitudes Toward and Interests in Physical Activity of Edmonton Secondary School Students," M.A. Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1967.

20. Semotiuk, Darwin M., "The Development of a Theoretical Framework for Analyzing the Role of National Government Involvement in Sport and Physical Education and Its Application to Canada," Ph.D. Thesis, The Ohio State University, 1970, 433 pp.

21. Herndon, Myrtis E., Comparative Physical Education and International Sport, Parts I and II, (Washington, D.C.: AAHPER, 1972).

22. Herndon, Myrtis E., Thesis and Dissertations, (Washington D.C.: AAHPER, 1973)

23. Vendien, C. Lynn and Nixon, John E., The World Today in Health, Physical Education and Recreation, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1968).

24. Bennett, Bruce L, Howell, Maxwell L., and Simri, Uriel, Comparative Physical Education and Sport, (Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger, 1975).